

### **Remarks**

Claims 66-82 have been added. Support for these newly added claims may be found throughout the specification and in particular by original claims 1-22.

### **Election**

The Applicant affirms the election of Group II, Claims 23-27, 32, 37, 42, 47 and 52 drawn to an article with a layer of defined solubility. The Applicant has cancelled the claims of non-elected Group I and III. The Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the non-elected claims in a divisional application.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 23-24, 26-27, 32 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Malik et al. The Examiner alleges that since the composition is useful on clothing or as a coating on clothing and since most clothing is dyed or has logos or designs printed on it, the composition is assumed to be printable, even though the exact phrase is not used. The Examiner makes reference to column 1, line 53.

The entire sentence the Examiner has referred to begins at column 1, line 51 of the "Background of the Invention" and states as follows:

"These properties make fluorinated materials useful for diverse application ranging from non-stick frying pan to water repellant coating to drag-reducing coatings."

The Applicant does not agree with the rationale set forth by the Examiner. At column 4, line 41 the compositions of U.S. Patent No. 5,637,772 are described as being "More hydrophobic and non-stick than Teflon." One of ordinary skill in the art appreciates that Teflon is not "hydrophobic" as claimed in U.S. Patent No. 5,637,772. The Examiner's rationale is not persuasive.

However, since the ink adhesion of solvent-based inks generally relates to the receptivity to the solvent of the ink composition, one would expect that an acetone-based ink (if such ink exists) would adhere to the composition of Example 19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,637,772.

For this reason, claim 23 has been amended to delete "acetone". Further claims 80-81 have been added. In these claims the term "acetone" has been retained, yet each of these claims further recite the composition of the printable polymeric layer.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Malik et al. in view of Seltmann et al. and Roitman et al.

Claims 32, 37, 42, 47 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fleming in view of Malik et al.

Since both of these rejections rely on the composition of Malik et al., these rejections are moot in view of the amendments.

The Applicant has responded to all the rejections set forth by the Examiner. Reconsideration and a timely allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

3-25-03  
Date

By: Carolyn A. Fischer  
Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091  
Telephone No.: (651) 575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel